

## REMARKS

Claims 84-133 remain in the present application. Claims 132-133 are added herein. Claims 84, 96, 108 and 120 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

### Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic examiner interview was conducted on November 5, 2008 between Examiner Kevin Nguyen and Applicants' representative Bryan M. Failing. The 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection, 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection and the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of independent Claims 84, 96 and 120 were discussed. No agreement was reached with respect to the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection and the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection. With respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection, it was agreed that rejected Claims overcome the cited references. Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 108-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the rejection states that the originally-filed specification does not provide support for the combination of elements of “a computer-usable medium” as recited in Claims 108-119. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants direct the Examiner to lines 8-9 of page 3 which describes “media containing instructions for the operation of visual display system as described.” Additionally, lines 21-22 of page 3 describe that the instructions are part of “software running the display device.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention are computer-implemented, and therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the originally-filed specification provides support for the combination of elements of “a computer-usable medium” as recited in Claims 108-119. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 108-119 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of record.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,100,862 to Sullivan (referred to herein as “Sullivan”). Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Sullivan for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 84 which recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

a composite display device comprising:  
a first display screen operable to display a first image using a first plurality of pixels of said first display screen; and  
a second display screen overlapping said first display screen, wherein said second display screen is partially transparent, and wherein said second display screen is operable to display a

second image using a second plurality of pixels of said second display screen; and

a user interface component for enabling user selection of at least one display screen, said at least one display screen for responding to an input, and wherein said at least one selected display screen comprises a display screen selected from a group consisting of said first and second display screens.

Independent Claims 96 and 120 recite elements similar to independent Claim 84.

Claims 85-86, 89-91, 93-95, 97-98, 101-103, 105-107, 121-123, 126-127 and 130-131 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further elements of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a first display screen operable to display a first image using a first plurality of pixels of said first display screen” and “wherein said second display screen is operable to display a second image using a second plurality of pixels of said second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 84. As recited and described in the present application, a first display screen is operable to display a first image using a first plurality of pixels of the first display screen. Additionally, a second display screen is operable to display a second image using a second plurality of pixels of the second display screen. In this manner, each of the first and second display screens includes a respective plurality of pixels for displaying a respective image.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Sullivan to teach projecting images (e.g., 86 and 88) onto a stack of optical elements (Abstract; Figures 6 and 7), where each of the optical elements includes a single

pixel (col. 8, lines 14-16). For example, Sullivan teaches that each of optical elements 36-42 is a single-pixel LCD (col. 8, lines 14-16). Accordingly, assuming *arguendo* that optical elements as taught by Sullivan are analogous to the claimed display screens, Applicants respectfully submit that Sullivan teaches display screens with only one pixel instead of a plurality of pixels as claimed. Further, assuming *arguendo* that projection of images onto optical elements as taught by Sullivan is analogous to displaying images using display screens as claimed, Applicants respectfully submit that Sullivan teaches displaying each image using a respective *single pixel* instead of a respective *plurality of pixels* as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a first display screen operable to display a first image using a first plurality of pixels of said first display screen” and “wherein said second display screen is operable to display a second image using a second plurality of pixels of said second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 84.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 84 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Sullivan, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 96 and 120 recite elements similar to independent Claim 84, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 96 and 120 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Sullivan. Since Claims 85-86, 89-91, 93-95, 97-98, 101-103, 105-107, 121-123, 126-127 and 130-131 recite further limitations to the embodiments of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 85-86,

89-91, 93-95, 97-98, 101-103, 105-107, 121-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Sullivan. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are allowable.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

##### Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131

Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan. Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are not rendered obvious by Sullivan since Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a first display screen operable to display a first image using a first plurality of pixels of said first display screen” and “wherein said second display screen is operable to display a second image using a second plurality of pixels of said second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 84, and similarly recited in independent Claims 95 and 120. Since Claims 85-86, 89-91, 93-95, 97-98, 101-103, 105-107, 121-123, 126-127 and 130-131 recite further limitations to the embodiments of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 85-86, 89-91, 93-95, 97-98, 101-103, 105-107, 121-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are also not rendered obvious by Sullivan. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are allowable.

Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129

Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan in view of United States Patent Number 6,468,157 to Hinami et al. (referred to herein as “Hinami”). Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129 are not rendered obvious by Sullivan in view of Hinami since Hinami, either alone or in combination with Sullivan, also fails to fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a first display screen operable to display a first image using a first plurality of pixels of said first display screen” and “wherein said second display screen is operable to display a second image using a second plurality of pixels of said second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 84, and similarly recited in independent Claims 95 and 120. Since Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129 recite further limitations to the embodiments of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129 are not rendered obvious by Sullivan in view of Hinami. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129 are allowable.

Claims 87, 99 and 128

Claims 87, 99 and 128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan in view of United States Patent Number 6,246,407 to Wilks et al. (referred to herein as “Wilks”). Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 87, 99 and 128 are

not rendered obvious by Sullivan in view of Wilks since Wilks, either alone or in combination with Sullivan, also fails to fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a first display screen operable to display a first image using a first plurality of pixels of said first display screen” and “wherein said second display screen is operable to display a second image using a second plurality of pixels of said second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 84, and similarly recited in independent Claims 95 and 120. Since Claims 87, 99 and 128 recite further limitations to the embodiments of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 87, 99 and 128 are not rendered obvious by Sullivan in view of Wilks. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 87, 99 and 128 are allowable.

Claims 84-86, 94-98, 106-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131

Claims 84-86, 94-98, 106-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 5,729,219 to Armstrong et al. (referred to herein as “Armstrong”) in view of the background section of the present application (referred to herein as “Background”). Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 84-86, 94-98, 106-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are not rendered obvious by Armstrong in view of Background since it was agreed during the Examiner Interview that Claims 84-86, 94-98, 106-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 overcome the cited references. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 84-86, 94-98, 106-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-131 are allowable.

### General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.



### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 84-133 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 12 / 8 / 2008

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060